

REMARKS

This paper is presented in response to the final official action of July 16, 2008. The advisory action of August 27, 2008, is acknowledged.

In the final official action of July 16, 2008, (a) claims 1-4 and 6-15 were pending, (b) claims 1-4 and 6-15 were rejected as indefinite, (c) claims 1-4 and 6 were rejected as anticipated by Lindenmeier US 6,917,340 ("Lindenmeier"), (d) claims 1, 2, 8, 10, 12, 13, and 15 were rejected as obvious over Ericsson Inc. WO 01/71846 ("Ericsson") in view of Lindenmeier, (e) claims 7, 9, and 11 were rejected as obvious over Lindenmeier and/or Ericsson in view of Abramo US 5,600,335 ("Abramo"), and (f) claim 14 was rejected as obvious over Ericsson modified by Lindenmeier in view of Ohe, et al. US 4,788,549 ("Ohe").

Claim 1 has been amended to address the indefiniteness issue and to incorporate the limitations of claims 2-4 (claims 2-4 have been cancelled). Claims 6, 8, 10, and 13 have been amended to correct their respective dependencies in view of the cancellation of claims 2-4, and claim 14 has been amended to omit reference numerals.

Claim 1 is further amended based on a discussion with the examiner on September 15, 2008, to clearly recite that each subsequent conductor portion of each recited antenna decreases in length with respect to a base point.

Reconsideration of the application, as amended, is solicited.

The issues raised in the official action are addressed below in the order in which they appeared in the action.

Indefiniteness

Claim 1, and thus dependent claims 2-4 and 6-15 were found to be indefinite due to alleged unclarity in the recitation of "printed-conductor portions.....are a shorter length with increasing distance from the base point."

Claim 1 has been revised for clarity and no longer contains the above language. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the indefiniteness rejection is solicited.

Anticipation and Obviousness

All art-based rejections depend on Lindenmeier.

Claim 1 has been amended to incorporate the limitations of claim 5 and all intermediate claims 2-4. Claim 1 is further amended to recite that each subsequent conductor portion of each recited antenna decreases in length with respect to a base point located at an open end of the antennae. Lindenmeier U.S. 6,917,340 does not teach this feature. In particular, the examiner points to Lindenmeier for showing different sized conductor portions, however, the conductor portions of Lindenmeier (see Figure 5) are not arranged to sequentially decrease in length, as recited by the amended claim. Thus, Lindenmeier does not anticipate pending claim 1 or claims 6-15 depending therefrom.

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of the claims. Should the examiner wish to discuss further any matter of form, she is urged to telephone the undersigned at the indicated number.

September 16, 2008

Respectfully submitted,

By 
Oliver T. Ong, Reg. No. 58,456
MARSHALL, GERSTEIN & BORUN LLP
6300 Sears Tower
233 South Wacker Drive
Chicago, Illinois 60606-6357
(312) 474-6300
Attorney for Applicant